

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 3 and 17 are canceled, and claims 1, 5, 9, 15, and 19 are amended. No new matter is introduced. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figure 3 and at page 4, lines 2-3, page 6, lines 13-14, and page 6, lines 23-24 of the specification. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) over U.S. Patent 6,604,108 to Nitahara (hereafter Nitahara). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 17 have been cancelled, rendering the rejections of claims 3 and 17 moot.

Nitahara is directed to an information mart system and information mart browser. The information mart system collects financial and testing data in the context of drug testing by pharmaceutical companies. However, Nitahara does not disclose or suggest “appending a source identifier as a key field to the data before combining the database tables into larger tables in a display context so that name spaces of the data are unique within each data context; combining the database tables into the larger tables in the display context without violating relational database rules ... enabling the user to modify the data through the conduits,” as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added).

Nitahara’s information mart system provides an abstraction layer to normalize the database schema. In contrast, the conduits recited in claim 1 provide an abstraction layer to make the data unique so that the data can be combined into a single database without violating relational database rules. In addition, Nitahara’s information flow is unidirectional flowing from data sources to the information mart system. Conversely, the conduits recited in claim 1 provide bidirectional information flow so that a user can modify the data through the conduits. None of these features are disclosed or suggested by Nitahara. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 4-8 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 9, for at least the same reason as stated above with respect to claim 1, Nitahara does not disclose or suggest “a conduit that append a source identifier as a key field to the data before combining the database tables in the display context so that name spaces of the data are unique within each data context, wherein the data are combined without violating relational database rules ... wherein the user can modify the data through the

conduit," as recited in amended claim 9 (emphasis added). Since Nitahara does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 9, claim 9 is allowable.

Claims 10-14 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 9 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 15, for at least the same reason as stated above with respect to claim 1, Nitahara does not disclose or suggest "appending a source identifier as a key field to the data before combining the database tables into larger tables in a display context so that name spaces of the data are unique within each data context; combining the database tables into the larger tables in the display context without violating relational database rules ... enabling the user to modify the data through the conduits," as recited in amended claim 15 (emphasis added). Since Nitahara does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 15, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16 and 18-20 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 15 and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of rejections of claims 1-2, 4-16, and 18-20 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 2, 2004


Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews & Kurth LLP
1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739